



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,563	03/23/2001	Shunpei Yamazaki	SEL 248	9704

7590 11/15/2005  
COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
SUITE 2850  
220 WEST ADAMS STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

MACCHIAROLO, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/815,563

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J. Macchiarolo

Art Unit

2879

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.


Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because of the following reasons:

Applicant alleges that the motivation provided in the final office action to combine Beesely and Terao is not proper since Applicant could not find such a disclosure or teaching in the references. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and directs Applicant to column 8, lines 18-27 of Terao, "Any positional relationship is feasible as far as the first conductor 2a and the second conductor 2b are electrically connected to each other." This citation coupled with figures 8c and 8e indicates that it is indeed a matter of obvious design choice to manufacture the wirings beneath the anode instead of beside the anode.

Secondly, regarding Applicant's assertion that no motivation exists in either Beesely or Terao to combine these two references, the Examiner reminds Applicant that the motivation may come from the references themselves OR IN THE KNOWLEDGE GENERALLY AVAILABLE TO ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART. See MPEP 2143.01. Therefore, since the motivation in the final office action came from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness have been established, and the final rejection stands.

For Applicant's convenience, the Examiner hereby restates the motivation supplied in the previous rejection; one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to such a configuration with a reasonable expectation of success for a variety of reasons, including reducing manufacturing time and money. A specific example of such a time and money saving method is explained in detail below:

With wirings being first formed on the substrate, the anodes may be formed on top of the wirings with less accuracy and more reliability that the wirings and anodes will be electrically connected, as opposed to forming the wiring directly beside the anode. These relatively loose tolerances will allow for less expensive manufacturing machines and procedures, and will also reduce manufacturing time.

  
**JOSEPH WILLIAMS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**